

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/763,185	<b>Applicant(s)</b> TAFUKU ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Sherali Ishrat	<b>Art Unit</b> 2624	

**All Participants:**

(1) Sherali Ishrat.

(2) Mehdi D. Sheikrez.

**Date of Interview:** 24 October 2008

**Status of Application:** \_\_\_\_\_

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Time:** 12:00

**Type of Interview:**

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

*na*

Claims discussed:

*16*

Prior art documents discussed:

*na*

**Part II.**

**SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:**

*Examiner informed Applicant's Attorney that based on the amendment and arguments , application is in condition for allowance. However, claim 16 is a method claim, which needs to tie to an an apparatus such as processor in figure 1. Applicant's Attorney agreed to amend claim 16 to tie method claim with an apparatus by an examiner's amendment and providing recommended amendment by fax.*

**Part III.**

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/Sherali Ishrat/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2624

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

